

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Boroson (US Publication No. 2005/0005232).

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to clearly show that there is a difference between the subject matter in these independent claims and that disclosed in the cited Boroson, et al. publication. Dependent claims 7 and 16 have been amended to be respectively consistent with amended independent claims 1 and 8. As understood, the Examiner's position is that Boroson, et al. and claims 1 and 8 have similar structures. The Examiner's position is that unfiltered light can pass through the portion where filters in Boroson et al. are not placed. This is of course, unwanted light. As Boroson et al. discusses in paragraph 0022, the dimensions of the OLED device shown in Fig. 7, are not to scale and one skilled in the art would understand that the device should be constructed so as not to produce light between subpixels. In any event, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 to more clearly set forth the invention. The light that is normal to the substrate is shown in Fig. 1 and Figs. 4a, 4b, and 4c. In Fig. 7 of Boroson et al., the normal light is shown by arrows 30a, 30b, 30c, and 30d. With respect to the Boroson et al., normal light is either filtered as in pixels 55a, 55b, 55c or unfiltered as in pixel 55d as shown in Fig. 7. Boroson et al. uses the term "pixel" to indicate what is referred to as a "subpixel" in the present application. There is no subpixel in Boroson et al. that has both filtered and unfiltered normal light as required by claims 1 and 8.


Applicant has amended claims 7 and 16 to be consistent with their corresponding base claims.

Applicant has made a sincere attempt to distinguish claims 1 and 8 over Boroson et al. Both Boroson et al. and the present application were owned by the Eastman Kodak Company at the time they were filed and continue to be owned by the Eastman Kodak Company. Therefore, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be removed. Accordingly, Applicant believes that this case is in condition for allowance, the notice of which is urged.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and place the case in condition for allowance. If there are any problems with these changes, Applicant's attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/djw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-4653
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.